
From: Richard Izmirian [mailto:izmirian@earthlink.net]
Sent: Sunday, December 09, 2007 11:16 PM
To: MLPAComments
Subject: Oppose designation of Pescadero Lagoon as State Marine Reserve

Dear MLPA Stakeholder Group Members:

I am surprised to learn that Pescadero Lagoon in San Mateo County is included in some draft proposals to be included in the MPA as a State Marine Reserve. If implemented, this action would eliminate the limited catch and release fishing activity in Pescadero Lagoon. I have reviewed the draft options and the rationales given for their inclusion by the MPLA work groups. I also reviewed the six stated goals of the MLPA. With due respect for the hard working participants in the planning effort, I must question the achievement of any of these goals by the inclusion of Pescadero Lagoon.

• Goal 1: To protect the natural diversity and abundance of marine life, and the structure, function, and integrity of marine ecosystems.

The limited angling, short season, and catch and release regulations for steelhead at Pescadero Lagoon provide ample protection from recreational fishing impacts to these fish. Angling pressure is not the limiting factor for steelhead and coho salmon populations in the Pescadero/Butano watersheds.

• Goal 2: To help sustain, conserve, and protect marine life populations, including those of economic value, and rebuild those that are depleted.

The driving force behind all efforts to restore the anadromous fish populations of Pescadero and Butano Creeks have come from sport anglers. Our local, state, and federal public trust agencies have required prodding for decades to act on behalf of the species of concern. How will designation as a State Marine Reserve guarantee implementation of a solution to the hydrogen sulfide fish kills that occur when the marshes drain into the lagoon during rapid lagoon dewatering when the mouth opens?

• Goal 3: To improve recreational, educational, and study opportunities provided by marine ecosystems that are subject to minimal human disturbance, and to manage these uses in a manner consistent with protecting biodiversity.

Implementation of a fishing closure will have the opposite effect of the stated goal.

• Goal 4: To protect marine natural heritage, including protection of representative and unique marine life habitats in California waters for their intrinsic value.

Those of us who have been fishing the Lagoon for decades understand and appreciate the natural heritage and the intrinsic value of these habitats more than anyone I can think of.

• Goal 5: To ensure that California's MPAs have clearly defined objectives, effective management measures, and adequate enforcement, and are based on sound scientific guidelines.

This is certainly a worthy goal, but the management plans prepared for Pescadero marsh and lagoon have been ignored. Little enforcement occurs, except for that provided by concerned anglers.

- **Goal 6: To ensure that the MPAs are designed and managed, to the extent possible, as a component of a statewide network.**

A linkage between Pescadero Lagoon and Elkhorn Slough is given as justification of this goal. I don't understand this linkage, but it sure doesn't sound like justification to close fishing at Pescadero Lagoon.

Not only have I fished Pescadero Lagoon for decades, I have been involved in restoration projects from the headwaters to the estuary for over 30 years. The same can be said of others that appreciate this special place. Please seriously consider the comments of Pescadero anglers.

Richard Izmirian
2215 Eaton Avenue
San Carlos, CA 94070